

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
8 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
9 AT TACOMA

10 JOHN THOMAS ENTLER,

11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13 FRANCISCO PERALES, *et al.*,

14 Defendants.

Case No. C07-5167 FDB/KLS

ORDER DENYING DEFENDANTS'
MOTION TO EXTEND TIME TO
RESPOND TO PLAINTIFF'S
MOTION FOR SUMMARY
JUDGMENT

15 This civil rights action has been referred to the undersigned Magistrate Judge pursuant to
16 Title 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local MJR 3 and 4. Presently before the Court is Plaintiff's
17 motion for summary judgment (Dkt. # 27) and Defendants' motions to extend the time to respond to
18 Plaintiff's motion. (Dkt. # 30 and 32¹). Plaintiff opposes the motion. (Dkt. # 33).

19 Plaintiff's motion for summary judgment (Dkt. # 27) is presently noted for hearing on June
20 20, 2008. Defendants contend, *inter alia*, that their time to respond to Plaintiff's motion must be
21 extended so that they can conduct deposition and written discovery of the Plaintiff and that the
22 interests of justice require an extension so that their own summary judgment can be heard
23 simultaneous with Plaintiff's motion. (Dkt. # 30, p. 2).

24 ¹Dkt. # 32 entitled Praecipe re Motion for Extension appears to be a duplicate filing that is
25 dated.

1 Defendants offered no explanation of why no discovery has been conducted over the past
2 five months. Additionally, since the filing of their motion for an extension of time, Defendants
3 filed a response to Plaintiff's motion (Dkt. # 34) and a motion for summary judgment (Dkt. # 35).

4 Accordingly, it is **ORDERED**:

5 (1) Defendants' motions for continuance of time to respond to Plaintiffs' motion for
6 summary judgment (Dkts. # 30 & 32) are **DENIED**.

7
8 DATED this 5th day of June, 2008.

9
10 
11 Karen L. Strombom
12 United States Magistrate Judge